



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/539,059	01/30/2006	George Victor Rissik	RISS3001/JE/JS	4270
23364 7590 05/22/2008 BACON & THOMAS, PLLC 625 SLATERS LANE FOURTH FLOOR ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314				
EXAMINER HEWITT, JAMES M				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3679				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/22/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/539,059

Applicant(s)

RISSIK, GEORGE VICTOR

Examiner

JAMES M. HEWITT

Art Unit

3679

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 April 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 6-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 6-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 4/14/08 has been entered.

Specification

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because on line 1 the term "apparata" is incorrect. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Objections

Claims 7-9 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 7 depends from canceled claim 1. For examination purposes, claim 7 has been considered to depend from claim 6.

Claim 8 depends from canceled claim 2. For examination purposes, claim 8 has been considered to depend from claim 7.

Claim 9 depends from canceled claim 1. For examination purposes, claim 9 has been considered to depend from claim 6.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

In claim 6, line 9, the recitation that the first extension (fitted to the inlet end of the elbow joint) terminates in a spigot constitutes new matter not supported by the original disclosure.

In claim 6, line 14, the recitation that the second extension (fitted to the outlet end of the elbow joint) terminates in a socket constitutes new matter not supported by the original disclosure.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Durigon (EP 0 745 744 A1) in view of Chien et al (US 2004/0046386 A1) and further in view of Sulzyc et al (US 5,551,734).

With respect to claim 6, Durigon discloses a directional control means for submerged surface suction cleaning apparatus comprising: an elbow joint (154) terminating in an inlet end (156) and an outlet end, the inlet and outlet ends being inclined relative to each other and defining a peripheral groove adjacent the inlet end (156); a first extension (218) fitted to the inlet end of the elbow joint; and a second extension (158) fitted to the outlet end of the elbow joint, the second extension terminating in a protruding socket configured to receive a flexible hose. The inlet end (156) includes a groove presumably for swivel fitment to a corresponding rib on the extension (218). The outlet end includes a rib that is received in a groove on the inner surface of second extension (158). Durigon fails to teach that each end of his elbow joint is a male end. Chien et al teach an elbow swivel joint that has two male ends which are received in two extension-like pieces. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Durigon's elbow to have two male ends as taught by Chien et al since it has

been held that a mere reversal of essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. Durigon/Chien et al fail to teach that the first extension comprising a peripheral rib configured to engage the peripheral groove adjacent the end of the inlet end in a snap fit, so as to allow the first extension to swivel relative to the elbow joint, and that the second extension comprising a peripheral rib configured to engage the peripheral groove adjacent the end of the outlet end in a snap fit, so as to allow the second extension to swivel relative to the elbow joint. Sulzyc et al teaches a swivel connection wherein the male member is provided with a rib that is received in a snap-fit in a groove in the female member to permit axial locking yet allowing free rotation. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Durigon/Chien et al such that the male ends of the elbow include integral ribs and their respective extensions include corresponding grooves in order to provide an audio indication of connection.

With respect to claim 7, Durigon/Chien et al/Sulzyc et al disclose a directional control means as claimed in claim 1 wherein the inlet end and the outlet end are inclined to each other at 135°. Refer to Durigon.

With respect to claim 8, Durigon/Chien et al/Sulzyc et al disclose a directional control means as claimed in claim 2, but fails to teach that the inlet end and the outlet end are inclined to each other at 150°. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Durigon's elbow

Art Unit: 3679

(154) such that the angle between the inlet and outlet ends is at 150 degrees since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art.

Applicant's modification of the angle may lead to beneficial results, but not unexpected and unpredictable results.

With respect to claim 9, Durigon/Chien et al/Sulzyc et al disclose a directional control means as claimed in claim 1 wherein the peripheral rib and the peripheral groove are formed with anti-friction surfaces (plastic/metal). Refer to Sulzyc et al.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JAMES M. HEWITT whose telephone number is (571)272-7084.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Daniel Stodola can be reached on 571-272-7087. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/James M Hewitt/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3679